DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 329 HE 010 541

AUTHOR Weischadle, David E.
TITLE The Carnegie Corporation of New York and American Educational Policy 1945-1970.
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 58p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the History of Education Society (Toronto, Canada, October 14-16, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Economics; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; *Foundation Programs; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Political Influences; Private Financial Support; *Public Education; *Public Policy; Public Schools; School Industry Relationship; Socioeconomic Influences; Trusts (Financial)
IDENTIFIERS *Carnegie Corporation of New York

ABSTRACT

Foundation involvement in policy development for public education raises basic questions concerning the control of a prime societal function. During the Cold War era (1945-1970) the Carnegie Corporation of New York funded projects according to its philosophical interests, using its financial and organizational prominence and cooperative strategies to capture a national policy-making role. The power or influence levied by the Corporation rested with its financial wealth, and the ability of its founder to place it in a trust fund with special privileges, such as tax exemption. The managerial class that has developed around these special trust funds holds no special talent, ability, education, or competence that is not found elsewhere. They do, however, have a unique quality of influence deriving from access to the Carnegie wealth. The Corporation was in no sense a benevolent, impartial, independent broker of innovation and experimentation. Indeed, Carnegie had a cause and sought to establish that cause as national policy for the schools. Without public debate or national referendum the Corporation and its president over a 25-year period sought to achieve dominance in policy-making. The issue now faces American education: Should any group of individuals with special privileges and resources be able to influence education as Carnegie did in the postwar era? (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161329

THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK AND AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL POLICY 1945 - 1970

by

David E. Weischadle, Ed.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David E. Weischadle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Annual Meeting
History of Education Society
Toronto, Canada
October 14 - 16, 1977

Dr. David E. Weischadle is Associate Professor of Education, Department of Educational Leadership, School of Education, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey, 07043.

HE 010 541

Educational policy affecting American public schools is indeed of a frail and elusive character. There is no official national policy, except that which the schools exhibit. The establishment of that policy has its origins in a variety of sources: Professional educators, local boards of education, state and federal governmental agencies, and students themselves. To some measure, the resultant policy of the schools consists of an "open market" of influences. Any individual or group with the appropriate levers can ply upon the schools and alter the direction of American education.

Since World War II, the public schools have faced changes wrought by the shifting of national forces affecting education.[1] One of these national forces was the philanthropic foundations. Such foundations as Ford, Sloan, Markle, Kettering, and Danforth became key watchwords in the vocabulary of educational change, giving the effort funded a special significance in that it had seemingly been recognized as being important enough to receive a grant. However, the involvement of foundations in public education is far more significant than the symbolic appearance of a credit line. Indeed, foundation involvement in policy development for public education raises basic questions concerning the control of a prime societal function. Hence, the activities of one of the most active foundations in education, the Carnegie

Corporation of New York, become of supreme importance.

For many educators, the mere inclusion of a foundation in a project signifies independence, reliability, and truth. Consider, for example, the following statement:

> If it (open education) is a fad, then the US Office of Education, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford and Carnegie Foundations, colleges, school systems, administrators, teachers, and parents have all been badly duped. Since these conclusions do not seem likely, open education is not a fad.[2]

In sharp contrast, and reflective of the realities of foundation operations, were the comments of a Carnegie program officer asked to react to the role of foundations in the New York City school decentralization effort:

> It's a terrible question. You're playing God in the ghetto. Money alters power relationships. When you give money, you are giving jobs, power, and patronage.[3]

Hence, foundations are not neutral and benevolent in programs which aim to bring about change; they are active and prime participants.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the participation in public education of the Carnegie Corporation of New York during the Cold War era (1945-1970). In doing so, the Corporation's philosophy and funding program will be analyzed relative to its effect on American educational policy. As a result, the paper

will show that the Corporation funded projects according to its philosophical interests, using its financial and organizational prominence and cooperative strategies to capture a national policy making role during the twenty-five years following World War II.

Carnegie and Education.

The Carnegie name has long been associated with education, so much so that many fail to realize that the founder was the wealthy baron of United States Steel Corporation. Andrew Carnegie, the "Ironmaster," had in fact acquired his money through the many harsh realities of the nineteenth century labor disputes. By the end of that century, Carnegie's interest in steel waned in favor of philanthropy. His zeal in this regard was reflected in the number of charitable trusts established. For example, he founded for his native Scotland the Carnegie Trust for Universities of Scotland (1901) and the Carnegie Dunfermline Trust (1903). In 1902, he established the Carnegie Institute of Washington, and in 1907, the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh. The Carnegie Hero Fund came in 1904, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in 1910. In 1913, he founded the Carnegie Unified Kingdom Trust.

In 1905, Andrew Carnegie established his first foundation which was to have a major impact on policy for all levels of education, including the public schools. Called the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the trust was essentially a $10 million endowment to finance pensions for college and university professors. To overview the Foundation, Carnegie appointed twenty-five trustees. These trustees, charged with conducting the business of the Foundation, took decisive action on the question of eligibility, focusing not on the individual professor, but rather on the institution. Only professors who taught at institutions which required its freshmen to have completed sixteen units of instruction in prescribed subjects at the secondary level were eligible for the pension. So important was the Foundation's involvement that the standard unit was widely dubbed "the Carnegie Unit," a measurement device which had universal impact on secondary schools.[4]

At least two trustees, Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia and Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, had been attempting to encourage all colleges and universities to use the standard unit in order to upgrade their institutions. Their encouragement was reflected in their membership in key organizations and

groups attempting to protect the standards of the prestigious Northeastern colleges and universities. To some degree, they were attempting to make all institutions which wished to be called a college or university conform to their entrance requirements. These groups (see Chart A) though very prestigious and influential, had failed in their efforts. It was not until the appearance of Carnegie money in the form of pension stipends, which meant that an institution could attract faculty and still save the cost of this increasingly desired fringe benefit, that institutions throughout the country conformed. The effect swiftly impacted upon the secondary schools, which now had to insure their graduates would be accepted into choice colleges. In terms of foundation operations, it represented the initial test of power of a philanthropic trust to use its financial resources and prominence to bring about a change.

While Carnegie money was clearly a key factor, the Foundation's relationship with such groups as the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) was very much like an "interlocking directorate" found in industry at that time. The same key people or institutions had policy making roles in two or

Chart A: Carnegie Foundation Trustees, their College or University, and other Affiliation.

Name / College or University	C 10	CCER	AAU	CEEB
Hill McClelland Bell				
Drake University(Iowa)				
Nicholas Murray Butler		X	X	X
Columbia University (N. Y.)				
Edwin Boone Craighead				
Tulane University (La.)	X	X		
William Henry Crawford				
Allegheny College (pa.)				
George Hutcheson Denny				
Washington and Lee University (Va.)				
Charles W. Eliot	X		X	X
Harvard University (Mass.)	X(4)	X(8)	X	X
Arthur Twining Hadley			X	
Yale University (Comn.)		X	X	X
William Rainey Harper			X	
University of Chicago (Ill.)	X	X(7)	X	

Chart A: Carnegie Foundation Trustees, their College or University, and Other Affiliation (Continued).

Name / College or University	C 10	CCER	AAU	CEEB
Charles Custis Harrison				
University of Pennsylvania	X	X	X	X
Edwin Holt Hughes				
DePauw University (Ind.)				
Alexander Crombie Humphreys				
Stevens Institute of Technology(N.J.)				X
David Starr Jordan				
Leland Stanford Junior University (Calif.)	X	X		
Henry Churchill King				
Oberlin College		X		
Thomas McClelland				
Knox College (Ill.)				
Samuel Black McCormack				
University of Pittsburgh (Pa.)				

Chart A: Carnegie Foundation Trustees, their College or University, and Other Affiliation (Continued).

Name / College or University	C 10	CCER	AAU	CEEB
William Peterson				
McGill University (Canada)				
Samuel Plantz				
Lawrence University (Wis.)				
Henry Smith Pritchett				
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Mass.)	X	X		X
Jacob Gould Schurman				
Cornell University (N. Y.)	X	X		X
Laurence Clark Seelye				
Smith College (Mass.)		X		X
Charles Franklin Thwing				
Western Reserve University (Ohio)				X
Woodrow Wilson	X		X	X
Princeton University (N. J.)	X	X	X	X

Chart A: Carnegie Foundation Trustees, their College or University, and Other Affiliation (Continued).

X - Stands for membership on committee or in organization.

( ) - Number in parenthesis stands for number of representatives on committee.

C 10 - Committee of Ten, National Education Association, or one of its subcommittees.

CCER - Committee on College Entrance Requirements, National Education Assication.

AAU - American Association of Universities - 1900

CEEB - College Entrance Examination Board - 1910

Sources: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Annual Reports, New York, 1906-1920; National Education Association, Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1893); National Education Association, Report of Committee on College Entrance Requirements (Washington, DC: The Association, 1899); American Association of Universities, Annual Reports, 1906- 1910; and College Entrance Examination Board, Annual Reports, New York, 1901 - 1910.

more organizations, thus able to exercise power and influence from several perspectives. It was indeed a frequently used approach in later foundation functions.

The Carnegie Foundation also established a substantial mark by commissioning Abraham Flexner to make a study of medical schools in North America.[5] However, the Carnegie pension plan, which was poorly planned, was draining the life out of the endowment. The college presidents, serving as trustees, had allowed a general distribution of money to take place, relieving themselves at the institutional levels of the need to provide such pensions. By 1918, the drain was so obvious and extant that the Carnegie advisors sought to shift this pension process to a contributory plan, thus they established the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA), an organization in which Carnegie presidents maintained involvement until 1938. With only a small portion of its endowment left, the Foundation has continued to exist, using funds from its sister trusts to oversee special projects primarily in the area of higher education.

By 1911, Andrew Carnegie had literally exhausted names for his philanthropic trusts, yet he still had the bulk of his

fortune without a suitable shelter. Not surprisingly, he was to establish his final trust with his remaining millions and in a business-like manner simply call it, the Carnegie Corporation of New York. In its charter, the Corporation purpose was simply:

> the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States and the British Dominions and Colonies.[6]

While alive, the Corporation was directly managed by the "Ironmaster," assisted by close advisors such as Elihu Root and his appointed presidents of other Carnegie funds. Andrew Carnegie grants went to build libraries, promote a phonetic alphabet, and to other personal interests. When he died in 1919, the Corporation passed on to public trustees, initially picked by the founder who in turn selected new members. Under the leadership of Frederick Paul Keppel, and other short term presidents, the Corporation enlarged its funding to include higher education as well as medicine and the Arts. It was Keppel, however, who insured the Corporation a viable existence by having the trustees grant monies from only the interest which the Corporation's stock portfolio earned.

Up to the period prior to World War II, the Corporation funded few projects impacting upon the public schools directly.

As Flexner noted,

> . . . the public schools exist by the thousands; they are almost wholly tax supported; they are organized in systems; teachers and curriculums can be changed only with great difficulty; so that even a successful experiment makes its way slowly.[7]

This observation by the former Carnegie associate clearly identified the task which the Corporation had to overcome in the Post War era. Single, isolated grants would have little impact. The Corporation had to develop an extensive funding program on a national scope and seek other agencies to assist in breaking down the traditional barriers to educational change.

In Pursuit of Excellence

In 1946, the Corporation's trustees and officers were very much aware of the issues being raised in the emerging Cold War period. No small influence was the presence of Vannevar Bush on the Carnegie board of trustees. As director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war, Bush was instrumental in initiating thinking toward the creation of a national research organization. In his report

to President Franklin Roosevelt, Science - The Endless Frontier, he established the groundwork for the National Science Foundation (NSF).[8] After the NSF became a reality in 1950, Bush joined other scientists who went before Congress to testify that the Russians were producing technicians at a much faster rate than the United States, that they were graduating engineers as fast as the United States, and that these factors would soon place Russia in an advantageous and dramatic position.

Furthermore, the Corporation's fundings in higher education put it in touch with men holding leading presidencies at prestigious colleges and universities. One such personage was James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard University. Conant, perhaps influenced by his work on the Manhattan Project and the Atomic Energy Commission, saw the strength of the United States in the ability of its schools and colleges to produce leaders of great talent.[9] Conant served as a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation and was later to serve the Corporation in a variety of roles. The Harvard president, with Carnegie aid, proved to be the most influential critic during the Sputnik era of the 1950's and 1960's.[10] He summarized his Cold war fear in 1961:

> . . . I do not have to remind the reader that the fate of freedom in the world hangs very much in balance. Our success against the spread of communism in no small measure depends on our successful operation of our free society.[11]

The Carnegie board of trustees, laden with corporate executives and lawyers, was obviously concerned with conserving America's political and economic conditions and was sensitive to the issue of the schools and their ability to produce talented people. When Roy E. Larsen of Time, Inc. suggested that the Corporation support a national movement of prominent laymen to improve the public schools, the trustees and officers quickly accepted. In 1948, the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools was awarded a $12,000 grant from the Corporation's discretionary fund, followed a short time later with a $200,000 grant in 1949.[12] Larsen, who was later to serve as a trustee of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education when founded in 1951, and Conant traveled extensively throughout the United States promoting the Commission as an important means of encouraging change in the schools.

Conant's involvement in any educational effort impressed the Corporation. His service was even more valued in actual foundation business. In 1946, Conant was asked to chair a special

committee funded by the Corporation with a $750,000 grant. Four testing programs, the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the Testing Service of the American Council on Education, the National Teachers Examination, and the Graduate Record Examination of the Carnegie Foundation, had grown substantially and needed organizational strengthening. The Conant committee attempted to determine how these programs could merge and function effectively. The result was a new single non-profit agency, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) of Princeton, founded on January 1, 1948 with Henry Chauncey of CEEB as its president. ETS under Chauncey, a former assistant dean at Conant's Harvard, expanded from being simply a testing agency serving education to a multi-service educational agency with a specialty in evaluation,[13] thus enabling it to provide almost any service desired of it.

By 1953, the Carnegie Corporation had finally settled into an organizational stability. Two short term presidents had left, and allowed a talented young man with a PhD from the University of California at Berkeley to assume the presidency. John W. Gardner had joined the Corporation prior to World War II and returned to it after military service as a Marine officer

in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). While at Carnegie Gardner was influenced by Conant and his ideas, particularly in terms of Conant's interpretation and revival of Jefferson's credo of joining education and leadership. In the spirit of Jefferson who identified one task of popular schooling to be instruction that would insure that ". . .the best geniusses(sic) will be raked from the rubbish,"[14] Conant lectured and wrote:

> . . .For the future we must endeavor to combine the British concern for training the "natural aristocracy of talents" with the American insistence on general education for all future citizens.[15]

"Talent" was to become an important word at Carnegie in Post war fundings. Gardner and the Corporation responded rapidly to the new impetus to improve elementary and secondary education. From service with the National Science Foundation, the Carnegie president was well aware of the ideas being set in motion. When the idea of major Mathematics revisions appeared, the Corporation quickly accepted a national role. For example, Gardner turned to the Educational Testing Service, created by the Corporation only a few years ago, and gained its cooperative participation in this new funding thrust. Hechinger decribed Gardner's ETS effort:

> . . . Mr. Gardner appointed the now famous Commission on Mathematics in 1955 at a time when the professional educational establishment still denied that any sweeping curriculum reforms were needed. The Commission set in motion a reform trend that gained political and educational popularity only late in 1957, after the first Soviet space satellite was launched.[16]

In an attempt to lay a solid foundation of support for such effort, Gardner was already discussing with Conant a Carnegie supported effort to focus public attention on the schools in a more direct way than the National Citizens for the Public Schools had been able to do. In 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had appointed Conant as High Chancellor, later Ambassador, to the Federal Republic of Germany. He returned in 1957, already assured a Carnegie grant was available for his use to conduct a study of his choosing.[17] Selecting to do a study on the American high school, the Corporation formalized its commitment into a $350,000 grant, with the understanding that ETS was the receiving agency and would provide any technical support needed.[18] The role of ETS proved to be a minor one, and perhaps simply an effort to aid additional prestige to the proposed study. Conant established offices in New York City, near the Corporation, and operated with a small staff. Later, Conant

served as a trustee at ETS with Gardner, hence in no way was ETS an independent agency providing insights to Conant's personal conclusions relative to American high schools.

The Carnegie grant resulted in Conant's The American High School Today.[19] Of his twenty-one recommendations in the report, thirteen of them could be found in his previously published works.[20] What made the Conant recommendations more effective at this time was the Carnegie involvement. The generous grant was widely publicized. The completed report gained wide coverage, partly due to Conant's prominence and the Corporation's grant. Perhaps more important was the "best seller" category of the report. In fact, Carnegie enabled the publisher to distribute free copies of the text to school board members and superintendents throughout the United States.[21]

At the same time, Gardner was writing in his annual reports about the value of the talented individual, characterizing the great demand for such individuals as "The Great Talent Hunt."[22] The Carnegie president was clearly establishing what he thought ought to be a national policy. Indeed, in Excellence, Gardner described education as a "Sorting Out Process," reaffirming a meritocracy concept of education.[23] The task of

the schools then was one of identifying talent and training them in special programs so that they will become the leaders in the emerging industrial and technological society. Hence, the schools must enter into a form of "triage," a sorting of the talented from the disabled or disadvantaged, and from the great "middle." Schools could then administer more effectively its scarce resources to these three groups. Conant proposed:

> My feeling is that in the best interests of all students, there should be ability grouping in grades 7 through 12 in such subjects as English, social studies, mathematics, and science. In short, my recommendation in both my senior high report and my junior high report still stands. In these subjects there ought to be subject-by-subject grouping in three groups - fairly small top and bottom group and a large middle group.[24]

That Carnegie was primarily interested with the talented was seen also in its support to national testing efforts. Gardner wrote that standardized tests do an unpopular job; e.g., deciding who does or does not go to college, but concluded:

> The best achievement and aptitude tests are remarkably effective in sorting out students according to their actual and potential performance in the classroom.[25]

Already aligned with Educational Testing Service, not suprising then was the Gardner-led Corporation support to the budding National Merit Scholarship Fund, which combined standardized testing, identification of the talented, and the award of cash stipends to talented students going into college. In 1955, the Corporation awarded $500,000 to John N. Stalnaker, a research psychologist at the College Boards' office at ETS for administrative costs.[26] It, too, enlarged to become a non-profit agency (the National Merit Scholarship Corporarion), but maintained its founding purpose:

> To identify, honor, and encourage academic excellence in a way that draws attention to the extent and importance of academic attainment of students, both for themselves and for the nation.[27]

After funding several special projects for the talented particularly the 1958 National Educational Association conference chaired by Conant,[28] the Corporation awarded a $225,000 grant to the State of North Carolina to operate the "Governor's School, a special eight-week institute for highly gifted youngsters at the Winston-Salem campus of the University of North Carolina.[29] Governor Terry Sanford, adopting the idea from a member of his personal staff, worked to obtain state support, especially when

it was enlarged under the aegis of the Learning Institute of North Carolina (LINC). LINC's new director was Harold Howe II, who as a Newton, Massachusetts, administrator worked with Harvard's Francis Keppel and later was to serve as superintendent of schools in Scarsdale where John Gardner resided. In danger of losing state funding, the Governor approached the Corporation and the US Office of Education seeking to use their special grants to cover general operations of the school until the legislature could be persuaded to fund the effort.[30] It was the beginning of a close relationship among Gardner, Keppel, Sanford, and Howe, a relationship that would lead to a highly influence role in national policy making.

By 1965, the Carnegie Corporation had well established a program based on a meritocratic principle. Its president, John Gardner, was to become a leading proponent and, in fact, built a national image based on a "pursuit of excellence." In doing so, the Corporation followed a vested interest, a cause which it promoted and developed with its prestigious funding program.

Funding "Excellence" for the Schools

Having established a cause, the Carnegie Corporation proceeded to launch a vigorous funding program impacting upon the schools. Carnegie became a substantial backer of the so-called "New Curricula" of the Cold War era as seen through its grants. As noted earlier, Gardner initiated a national trend at the College Boards in the field of Mathematics with a grant of $150,000.[31] He also alerted his staff of program officers at the Corporation to seek other supportive programs which could be funded. As one Carnegie executive noted:

> . . . the officer involved was continuing his task of becoming acquainted with the professors and teachers who saw the need most clearly. At the same time he was letting it be known in these circles that the Carnegie Corporation would be receptive to significant ideas for constructive action. Such ideas were soon forthcoming, and the Corporation was launched upon a new program.[32]

With Carnegie's interest in the talented, it was a natural progression for the Corporation to develop a program in support of a basic subject discipline. One of Conant's recommendations in The American High School Today called for the talented to have four years of Mathematics at the secondary level.[33] In 1956, Carnegie had already entered the "Math Wars"[34] with a grant of $227,000 to Professor Max Beberman of the University of Illinois Committee of School Mathematics(UICSM).[35] Over the next

five years, the Corporation was to fund a variety of Math projects; in 1959 alone, it invested $1 million into projects of this nature. Many of these projects involved the use of computers, programmed instruction, and other technological devices.[36]

If the Cold War provided a cause for Carnegie support of curriculum change in the schools, then it was Jerome Bruner who provided the rationale. In 1959, Carnegie provided assistance in planning a conference of academics to be held at Woods Hole on Cape Cod. Out of the conference, chaired by Bruner, a psychologist at Harvard, came The Process of Education.[37] Bruner's tract suggested that students learn the structure of the disciplines and seek to become the miniature scientist making discoveries. He also recognized that the rise of technology as an instructional process was now possible as a result of money being made available from the National Defense Education Act(NDEA) and concluded his book by stating:

> . . . The intelligent use of that (NDEA) money and of other resources now available will depend upon how well we are able to integrate the technique of the film maker or the program producer with the technique and wisdom of the skillful teacher.[38]

The strain of managing the numerous projects was beginning to take its toll on the universities serving as sponsoring agencies. Teaching schedules, facilities, and general morale often caused administrative disruptions and unhappiness. Furthermore, as the curriculum reformers began conducting field tests, producing films and other audio-visuals as Bruner suggested, and marketing its products, the universities found themselves in uncomfortable areas where they had little experience. Carnegie and others seeking to maximize its grant dollars had recognized the value of the non-profit corporate structure such as an Educational Testing Service. Such a centralized organization, devoted to production of curriculum and related materials, could well serve to consolidate the reform movement and produce more efficient curriculum change.

In reviewing the Carnegie funding pattern, it was apparent that the Corporation wished to fund or seed a project for a period of time and maintain it until it could acquire other funding. The non-profit structure of an ETS enabled the reformers to seek other funding, particularly governmental funding as such laws as NDEA became reality. In addition, the projects could well begin to sell its consultant services , thus supplementing

the income from products and materials. Thus, the Corporation was to actively support the non-profits and advancing federal legislative efforts to enact new laws which would reduce Carnegie's commitment and allow it to fund other efforts.

Jerrold Zacharias had located his Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC) at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he served as a member of the faculty. Soon the size of the staff grew beyond the available facilities. In 1958, the PSSC established Educational Services Incorporated (ESI) at Watertown, Massachusetts as a financially independent agency which could publish its own work, produce films, tapes, and recordings, and receive grants from all sources without involving MIT. By 1965, Carnegie had awarded over $1 million in grants to projects being conducted at ESI, including an off-shoot of the University of Illinois Math project.[39] ESI in 1965 merged with another non-profit to form the Education Development Center (EDC), whose efficiency in curriculum production caused it to be characterized as the "General Motors of Curriculum Reform."[40] Later that year EDC became a regional laboratory under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The following year, Arthur L. Singer, an executive associate at Carnegie was appointed

executive director of EDC.[41] The Carnegie involvement at EDC becomes even more significant as later discussion shows the detailed efforts related to the passage of ESEA.

Carnegie's support of technology in the classroom led its officers and staff to turn toward television as a possible useful, efficient way of reaching large numbers of youngsters. To develop its program, Lloyd Morrisett, the Corporation's vice president, hired Joan Ganz Cooney as a consultant. She designed a production concept, overviewed by a non-profit corporate structure, that would reach the pre-school audience. In 1968, the Corporation released Mrs. Cooney to establish a production company, the Childrens Television Workshop (CTW), and awarded her a grant of $1 million.[42] CTW went on to produce the highly successful Sesame Street and Electric Company television programs, attempting to teach reading and readiness skills for pre-schoolers and adolescence. In an effort to show the effectiveness of Sesame Street, the Workshop went to Educational Testing Service to substantiate that children who watch the program learned from it.[43] The positive findings of this report were especially opportune as criticism was beginning to question the series' learning value. Later reviews of the same data suggested that the ETS researchers may have

been overly optimistic about this product of another non-profit with the same Carnegie origin.[44]

The Carnegie Corporation was also the prime instrument in the creation of the medium over which the CTW was able to disseminate its programs. Under a $500,000 grant in 1965, the Corporation appointed the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.[45] The Commission, chaired by James R. Killian, Jr., president of MIT and member of the board of Education Development Center, also included two very prominent individuals--James B. Conant and Terry Sanford. The Commission's report[46] was widely distributed and was recognized as the impetus for the passage of key legislation (Public Broadcasting Act of 1967) creating the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and shifting the cost to public tax monies.[47] Killian was appointed to the chair of the newly created Corporation.

Clearly evident was a funding pattern that supported programs for the talented. A key element was a spirit of efficiency through the use of technology. Using its cause to organize its efforts, the Corporation funded into the experiments after they had already begun, but then promoted them through an array of non-profits and influential associates. Furthermore,

the Corporation was particularly successful in its ability to shift funding responsibility from it to other sources, thus establishing a separate existence for Corporation created entities.

Carnegie's "Washington Connection"

The Corporation's cause for excellence and its funding did reflect itself in substantial changes in American educational policy; the Conant reports, the curriculum reforms, and standardized testing to mention only a few. Perhaps even more influential, however, was the role which John Gardner developed as a leading figure in national educational affairs.

Assuming the Carnegie presidency in 1953, Gardner revised the Corporation's public relations program toward one of reaching the public directly. He enlarged and stylized the Annual Report to include a president's essay, allowing him to develop his philosophy and explain the Corporation's grants. In addition, he added the Carnegie Quarterly, a popular report of the Corporation's activities between Reports. Complementing these foundation publications were Gardner's popular hardcover and

paperback books.[48]

A prolific writer, Gardner also participated in a project launched by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund to examine the future of America during the Cold War era. Called the Pursuit of Excellence, the project included a special section on education written by Gardner.[49] He restated his previous theme:

> Unused talents lead to personal frustrations but they also deprive a society of the mainspring of its vitality. To realize our ideals of maximum personal development, it is not only essential that we inspire our people to the best that is in them but it is essential to give them an opportunity to exercise that best. A society must learn to regard every instance of a misuse of talent as an injustice to itself. And it must cultivate the ideal and the exercise of excellence by every man at its disposal.[50]

His membership in this group was the beginning of a series of national involvements that eventually brought Gardner to Washington.

Toward the end of his administration, President Dwight D. Eisenhower wanted to establish some direction for the 1960's. He turned to the American Assembly, an organization he established while president of Columbia and a member of the Carnegie Foundation's board of trustees. In the form of a special commission, the Assembly's effort included such personages as James B. Conant, James R. Killian, Jr., also serving as special assistant to Eisenhower for science and technology, and Clark Kerr,

president of the university of California and chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Commission produced a report, Goals for Americans, with a chapter on education written by John Gardner.[51]

Gardner once again emphasized the need to develop talent as a national policy. In addition, using Conant's words from the high school study, he also set the tone for his public life; i.e., that crisis was upon us and action had to be taken immediately:

> Education is important in any modern society, whatever its political or economic forms. But a society such as ours, dedicated to the worth of the individual, committed to the nurture of the free, rational, and responsible men and women, has special reasons for valuing education. Our deepest conviction impel us to foster individual fulfillment. We wish each one to achieve the promise that is within him. We wish each one to be worthy of a free society, and capable of strengthening a free society.[52]

Even more important than the continued crisis context was Gardner's opinion that the Corporation had the appropriate solutions in its fundings of prgrams for the talented and able.

With the election of John F. Kennedy, a new era of federal activism was about to commence. Kennedy established a series of task forces, the one on education being directed by

Frederich L. Hovde, president of Purdue and Carnegie roundation trustee. Its task was to identify ways in which the federal government could aid public schools. Included on the task force was Gardner and Harvard's dean of the graduate school of education, Francis Keppel. Keppel was the son of Frederick Paul Keppel, former president of both the Carnegie Corporation and Foundation. The younger Keppel was appointed to his post as dean by Harvard's president, James B. Conant. To revamp the school, Conant and Keppel secured a $300,000 grant and substantially changed the school.[53] In addition, Keppel as an informal advisor to the foundation, particularly when Harvard graduates and faculty applied for grants.[54] The influence of Carnegie on that task force was reflected in Kennedy's first education message to Congress;

> . . .Our twin goals must be: A new standard of excellence in education -- and availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to seek it. [55]

The following year, Gardner edited a special book containing Kennedy's speeches.[56] In 1963, Kennedy went back to his task force and chose Francis Keppel as his new US Commissioner of Education.

With much of Kennedy's program tied up in Congressional committees, educational changes failed to materialize. However,

President Lyndon Johnson was able after the assassination to alter Congressional relations and, by the beginning of his first full term, was prepared to take decisive action. He appointed John Gardner to chair his new task force in 1964 with Keppel serving in an ex officio capacity as Education Commissioner. The work of the task force was directly translated into legislation, the Johnson landmark education bill which became the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).[57] As Bailey and Mosher pointed out,

> . . . the educational laboratories were the brain child of Ralph W. Tyler, distinquished educator and member of the Gardner task force. The R&D Centers were to concentrate on research on particular educational problems. The laboratories were to engage largely in demonstration and dissemination activities.[58]

The basic impact of ESEA at the federal level was to enlarge and strengthen the US Office of Education. In effect, the Keppel-led agency began to function much on the order of a foundation, awarding grants to initiate special programs and projects. In fact, groups such as Education Development Center, Educational Testing Service, and other nonprofits of that nature became direct recipients of the fruits which ESEA created. To some measure, this new federal act reduced

their dependency on grants from foundations. Even more important, ESEA could be effectively used by an enlightened administration to shape the form of educational policy from the executive branch of the federal government. Through such funding segments as Title III, ESEA, even local districts could be persuaded with grants to try innovative programs and adopt them with additional grants.

Two months after President Johnson signed the ESEA he convened the White House Conference on Education. Its chairman was John Gardner, being assisted by such vice chairmen as Terry Sanford, James Conant, and Ralph Tyler. Also assisting was Lawrence Cremin of Teachers College, who was also writing a history of American education under a Carnegie grant. In fact, many of the participants were current or former grant holders. Cynically, it could have been called a "Carnegie Convention" in that the Corporation had funded much of the preliminary research and writing. Hechinger noted at the time:

> . . . An even subtler change could be detected in the nature of the conference leadership. Mr. Gardner is at the unofficial control center of power in the world of education, not because of the widespread trust in his sense and sophistication. He represents something new in national educational influence. He has, in the White House Conference, provided a working model of the "new men" who are likely to call the tune increasingly in the future.[59]

A month after the white House Conference, John Gardner was appointed by President Johnson as his new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). As one observer noted:

> The groundwork for the Great Society was laid by the foundations and some of their best men have gone to Washington to develop it, notably Mr. John Gardner.[60]

Gardner soon promoted Keppel to Assistant Secreatary of HEW for Education and brought Harold Howe II in as his new US Commissioner of Education, thus completing a seemingly powerful triumvirate. However, the Gardner team was met with the realities of politics and the dissipation caused by Vietnam, as well as general inability of a bureauracy to move fast.

The ascension of the Gardner-Keppel-Howe team to the executive branch of government represented what seemed to be the capstone of a twenty-year effort to establish the Carnegie Corporation in a solid policy making role. Through a funding program of promoting the cause for the academically talented, the Corporation gained a national reputation. Its timely grants, and the leadership provided by its president, made the Corporation a major influence in education, particularly at the national level. As an outside force, the Corporation was able to bring about change in policy, and as a result, gained for its chief executive officer, an inside role in the official machinery of federal educational policy making.

The "Connection" at Work

One of the most controversial issues raised at the White House Conference was that of National Assessment.[61] The establishment of this broad based testing program represented the kind of cooperative effort that was beginning to evolve about Corporation interests during the mid 1960's, as the Carnegie "washington Connection" was nearing completion. With a grant of $112,500 in 1964, the Corporation launched a special committee headed by Ralph Tyler, then director emeritus of the Center for the Advanced Study of Behavior, a Palo Alto "think tank" founded by the Ford Foundation. With a long interest in testing, Tyler was recognized as a major figure in measurement and evaluation.[62] Having served with Gardner on the 1964 task force, Tyler was able to impress on the president of the Corporation the value of some form of measurement to determine how well kids were learning on a national basis.

In keeping with its "pursuit of excellence," the Corporation became aware that the Tyler "quality control" concept could provide insight as to educational progress over a period of time.[63] With the Tyler committee established, Carnegie began promoting the concept in the form of an edu-

cational "Gross National Product" as an indicator of learning success.[64] Aiding Tyler were some Carnegie "regulars," for example Roy E. Larsen; Devereux Josephs, an insurance executive and former Carnegie Corporation president; John Corson, a Carnegie consultant and ETS trustee; and Lloyd Morrisett, the Corporation's current vice president. In Washington, Keppel was publicly encouraging this private effort on the part of the Corporation.[65]

Frankly, national testing programs have never enjoyed popular and widescale acceptance by professional educators. Quick to criticize National Assessment were such groups as the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators. Carnegie was being attacked by criticism such as the following:

> . . . Considering the magnitude of the proposition and the potential consequences which might ensue, moving from the formation of an Exploratory Committee to five group meetings to conferences with test developers to contracts with those same companies in less than eight months seems unnecessarily fast.[66]

Further criticism led the Corporation to enlarge the committee to include almost all professional organizations offering criticism. The strategy being that the criticism

could hardly be lodged against a program that they were part of. In 1968, George Brain replaced Tyler, and the group was renamed the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). It was not until the Education Commission of the States (ECS) agreed to oversee the National Assessment that the effort was given full acceptance. ECS, located at Denver, was an interstate agency comprised of governors, legislators, and educators aimed at influencing the state education systems. This seemingly broad based involvement, assured by ECS, reduced criticism and allowed for the start of National Assessment.[67]

In retrospect, however, the appearance of ECS in fact represented the coalescence of two Carnegie interests. In 1964 the Corporation financially supported the publication of Shaping Educational Policy, written by James B. Conant.[68] In this book, Conant discussed the issue of educational planning as fragmented throughout the states, concluding that an interstate compact had to be formed.[69] Carnegie asked Terry Sanford, then working under a Ford Foundation grant (A Study of the American States), to determine the feasibility of such a compact.[70] Sandford found such support and proceeded to establish the Compact in temporary offices at Duke University with

a grant from the Corporation for $175,000,[71] followed in 1967 with a $200,000 grant.[72] In 1967, Sandford wrote:

> . . . The Education Commission is enabling the states to unite in the resolve to meet their responsibility to the quickening interest of the American people in the pursuit of excellence. The Compact for Education places the states in the forefront of that pursuit.[73]

In March of 1969, ECS appointed James A. Hazlett as the administrator of the Assessment program with a projected budget of $4 million.[74] During the effort to buttress sagging support for National Assessment was a grant award of $1 million from the US Office of Education.

Keppel's early unpopular support of National Assessment did not go unnoticed at Carnegie. As Commissioner, Keppel was ordered by the 1964 Civil Rights Act to conduct a survey of educational opportunity in the nation's public schools. Led by James S. Coleman, a sociologist from Johns Hopkins, the study was supported with technical assistance from the US office of Education and Educational Testing Service.[75] Its conclusions relative to disadvantaged youngsters became subject to widespread debate. To assist Keppel, and later Howe, the Corporation made a $25,000 grant available to conduct a seminar of prominent educators aimed at supporting the basic concept.[76]

It repeated this effort again in 1968.[77]

Changes at the Office of Education were dramatic. As Howe noted in 1966:

> In December of 1964 the United States Office of Education was responsible for an annual budget of $1.5 million. Now, two years later, its budget is $4 billion. Any business which had expanded that fast would have experienced growing pains of the worst kind.[78]

Included in the U. S. Education Office's new budgets were funds to support such popular Carnegie programs as Sesame Street and Electric Company at Childrens Television Workshop. However, all was not smooth going in Washington.

Keppel was the first casualty, the victim of both Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago and President Johnson. Acting much like a foundation president, Keppel threatened to withhold federal funds unless the city of Chicago integrated its schools according to court and his agency's guidelines. This act caused Mayor Daley to telephone President Johnson who in turn released the funds and chided Keppel.[79] The former Harvard dean shortly thereafter resigned to become Chairman of the Board, General Learning Corporation, a profit making venture in educational technology by Time, Inc. and General Electric. Gardner continued in office until 1967, when he resigned reportedly out of sympathy with

Johnson's war policy.[80] His inability to move with the rapidity of a foundation president as the head of the largest bureauracy also was a factor. Harold Howe remained until the end of the Johnson administration, at that time joining the Ford Foundation for a tour in India and then beoming its vice president for education and research in 1970. Keppel left General Learning in 1974 to become the director of the Aspen Institute's Program in Education. Since 1970, he was serving as a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation.

During his tenure at HEW, Gardner served as president of the Corporation in an on-leave status. In 1968, he officially resigned this post, but stayed on as a full time consultant. In this capacity, Gardner was allowed to accept the chairman of the National Urban Coalition, a public interest group of prominent persons wishing to improve the plight of the city. The trustees of the Corporation

> . . .agreed that he (Gardner) should give most of his time to that organization since its purposes are within the current interests of the Carnegie Corporation.[81]

In 1971, as the Urban Coalition began to become more political, a fact which endangered Carnegie's position as a foundation which is not allowed to be involved in politics, Gardner was

to cut all official ties to the Corporation. During this same period, Gardner's name was a frequent topic in terms of elected political office. He was mentioned as a possible appointee of Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of New York, to fill the vacancy created by the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy.[82] He was also mentioned as a possible presidential candidate in 1970 for the Republican party.[83] In 1970, Gardner launched a major citizens lobby organization, the Common Cause, and became deeply involved in the reform of national government.

Gardner's successor at Carnegie was Alan Pifer, who for many years was director of the Corporation's Commonwealth Program. Pifer, like Gardner, saw education initially as a prime thrust for the Corporation. He was appointed by President Richard Nixon to chair his task force to prepare an agenda for his administration.[84] The President, however, discarded many of the recommendations as his administration focused on foreign affairs, the war in Vietnam, and later the economy. The Corporation continued to fund educational projects under Pifer, but not with the vigor seen under Gardner. For example, Pifer initiated "The Study of the Education of Educators," as an examination of the nation's graduate schools of education. Selected to do the

study with a $235,000 grant was Charles E. Silberman.[85] A best selling author and an editor on leave from Fortune Magazine, Silberman had indicated in previous writings that the use of technology in education was important in the future of education. With such figures as Keppel entering this field (Time, Inc. was the parent company of both Fortune and General Learning), Silberman appeared to be the appropriate individual to help the Corporation reassert its policy direction. For example, Silberman wrote:

> . . .the new business government thrust is likely to transform both the organization and the content of education, and through it, the character and shape of American society itself.[86]

Shortly after the initiation of the study, Silberman shifted his interest and topic to one of "open education" and finally produced his best selling, Crisis in the Classroom.[87] In spite of its popular success the Corporation has not carried on an active program in support of its proposals as it had with previous works of Conant. To some measure this fact showed the Corporation was becoming preoccupied with other matters. Pifer's disenchantment with the Nixon administration was certainly a factor. Even more important, however, was the renewed interest on the part of Congress in the operation of philanthropic foundations.

By 1968, Pifer was becoming the prime defender of foundations, describing this renewed interest in the following terms:

> The assault this year on foundations, if it reveals anything tells us that the safety of all types of private charitable organizations -- religious, educational, medical, and philanthropic -- may now be in serious doubt. . . . From what I have seen in Washington in recent months it is my sad conclusion that the role played by free, private institutions as a bulwark of the American democratic system may be in jeopardy. [88]

Pifer by 1970 had established his own style of running the Corporation, a style certainly differing not in substance, but in manner. The basic philosophical orientation remained, but certainly the president was allowing staff to seek new areas.[89] However, the staff was carefully selected and represented much of the Carnegie post war interests. For example, three of the program officers (executive associates) were from projects conducted by James Conant, Jerome Bruner, and Terry Sandford. Others came from non-profits and organizations supported with the Carnegie grants. Hence, while the Corporation's public role was changing, the Corporation was nevertheless maintaining an internal stability.

Clearly, there is some evidence that the Carnegie "Washington Connection" was beginning to function as a major force in educational policy making. Its failure to do much rested with other societal forces; the war, politics, and the economy. As

the Gardner-led triumvirate moved through Washington circles, it was able to reaffirm several of the Carnegie programs, shifting their support to new finance sources. The Corporation in the meantime continued to initiate new studies, but under a new president was also dealing with other interests. Taking a less public role, the Carnegie Corporation nevertheless maintained its basic philosophical thrust as its trustees, officers, and staff self-perpetuated themselves through the selection of their successors from people who shared tne same basic beliefs and interests.

The Carnegie Legacy

The departure of John Gardner left the Corporation without a charismatic leader. His successor seemingly saw the foundation taking a more subdued course; the trustees apparently agreed. Part of this course was to avoid confrontation with the United States Congress and committees headed by Wright Patman and then by Vance Hartke. Certainly, the Corporation continued to fund educational projects affecting policy. From 1969 to 1975, the Corporation awarded the Childrens Television

Workshop $2.1 million; Educational Testing Service, $1.6 million; Education Development Center, $1.9 million; and the College Entrance Examination Board, $2.1 million. It also funded during the same period such efforts as National Assessment ($.8 million), Education Commission of the States ($.5 million), the New York Urban Coalition ($.4 million), and Gardner's National Urban Coalition ($.7 million).

The Corporation's continued interest in education at the elementary and secondary level is a legacy of the post-War II period of activism. This era witnessesed the Corporation's earnests efforts to carry out what it saw as the means of maintaining a society which produced it. Building upon a "Social Darwinism" in which the talented succeeded, and had to succeed to maintain existence, the Carnegie Corporation coopted the Jeffersonian elitism of Conant and built a funding program upon its tenants of a discipline oriented curriculum of standard units and standardized tests to sort out the talented and measure the quality of education.

Of course, the presumptuous nature of the Corporation in believing it knew what the country and its state public

educational systems had to do was based on its own view of itself. The Corporation, under the stewardship of the wealthy and prominent trustees, selected a corps of managers to operate the foundation who in turn selected worthy applicants. In effect, the college trained managers were making selections on the basis of how they thought the trustees would select. The corporation was the living embodiment of what the Corporation thought society ought to be. Accordingly, the Carnegie officers and staff were enfranchised with the "Ironmaster's" wealth to choose perennial advisors, make vested grants, and seek national roles. They were indeed an educational "power elite." Mills' final words of his treatise may well characterize the "elite" Corporation:

> The men of higher circles are not representative men; their high position is not a result of moral virtue; their fabulous success is not firmly connected with meritorious ability. Those who sit in the seats of the high and mighty are selected and formed by the means of power, the sources of wealth, the mechanics of celebrity, which prevail in their society. They are not men selected and formed by a civil service that is linked to a world of knowledge and sensibility. They are not men shaped by nationally responsible parties that debate openly and clearly the issues this nation now so unintelligently confronts.[90]

Mills' comments are indeed cogent desciptions of the men at the Carnegie Corporation. The power or influence levied

by the Corporation rested with its financial wealth, and the ability of its founder to place it in a trust fund with special privilieges. Its tax exempted nature, its most important special privilege, allowed men like Andrew Carnegie to pass on his wealth almost intact with no need to pay inheritance tax. The managerial class that has developed about these special trust funds hold no special talent, ability, education, or competance that is not found elsewhere. They do, however, have a unique quality of influence, namely access to the Carnegie wealth. This access enlarged their ability, and credibility as well; for what they propose, they can also finance. Thus people listen, and follow their directions.

Hence, the Corporation was in no sense a benevolent, impartial, independent broker of innovation and experimentation. Indeed, Carnegie had a cause and sought to establish that cause as national policy for the schools. Without public debate, or national referendum, or other means, the Corporation and its president over a twenty-five-year period sought to achieve dominance in policy making, and during that time, was able to exercise a substantial influence while doing so. The Carnegie Corporation's combination of wealth and prominance gave it, and

other foundations, the power to do essentially what they wished to do. The issue has been defined by the Corporation, and now faces American education: Should any group of individuals with the special privileges and resources be able to influence education as Carnegie did in the Post War era?

Simple answers of "Yes" or "No" seem, and are, inappropriate. Clear, rational debate about the role of foundations is needed. Let us hope it will begin.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Roald F. Campbell and Robert A. Bunnell, Nationalizing Influences on Secondary Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1963).

[2]H. C. Sun, "A Reaction to 'Is Open Education a Fad,'" Phi Delta Kappan, LVII (October 1975), 118-119.

[3]Statement of Eli Evans, in Diane Ravitch, "Foundations: Playing God in the Ghetto," The Center Forum, May 15, 1969, p. 27.

[4]Edger B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 70. See also Ellsworth Tompkins and Walter H. Gaumnitz, The Carnegie Unit (Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, US Office of Education, 1954).

[5]Abraham Flexner, Medical Education in the United States and Canada (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910).

[6]A Manual of the Public Benefactions of Andrew Carnegie (Washington, DC: The Carnegie Endowment for Peace, 1919), pp. 211-212.

[7]Abraham Flexner, I Remember (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1940), p. 252.

[8]Vannevar Bush, Science: The Endless Frontier (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1945).

[9]See James B. Conant, Education and Liberty (New York: Vintage Books, 1953).

[10]Robert L. Church (with Michael W. Sedlak), Education in the United States (New York: The Free Press, 1976), p. 408.

[11]James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 34.

[12]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1949, p. 55.

[13]Henry Chaucey, "A Shift in Focus" in Educational Testing Service, Annual Report, Princeton, New Jersey, 1966-1967, pp. 12-14.

[14]Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia (1782: London, 1787), Query XIV: Laws.

[15]James B. Conant, Education and Liberty(New York: Vintage Books, 1953), p. 87.

[16]The New York Times, July 28, 1965, p. 18.

[17]Interview with Florence Anderson, Secretary of the Corporation at the Carnegie Corporation Headquarter at 437 Madison Avenue, New York City, on April 17, 1969.

[18]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1957, p. 34.

[19]James B. Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1959).

[20]See James B. Conant, Education and Liberty(New York: Vintage Books, 1953); and Education in a Divided World (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949) as well as Educational Policies Commission (chaired by Conant), Education for ALL American Youth (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1944).

[21]This practice of mailing free copies to certain designated individuals was repeated with his The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1963). About 5000 special paperbacks were mailed to similarly influential individuals, see The New York Times, September 15, 1963, p. 82.

[22]John W. Gardner, "The Great Talent Hunt," in the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1956, p. 12.

[23]John W. Gardner, Excellence (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), pp. 75-88.

[24]James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 64.

[25]John W. Garnder, Excellence(New York: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 57.

[26]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1955, p. 33.

[27]Guide to the National Merit Scholarship Program (Evanston, Illinois: National Merit Scholarship Corporation, 1972), p. ii.

[28]See James B. Conant, chairman, The Identification and Education of the Academically Talented Student in the American Secondary School (Washington, DC: National Education Association, February 1958).

[29]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1963, p. 9.

[30]Terry Sanford, But What About the People (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 165. The Carnegie grant was for $500,000.

[31]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1957, p. 77.

[32]Frederick H. Jackson, "The Private Foundation," an address at the National Conference on Curriculum Experimentation, September 25-30, 1961. See Paul C. Rosenbloom, ed., Modern Viewpoints in the Curriculum (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 212.

[33]James B. Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 57.

[34]Benjamin DeMott, "The Math Wars," The American Scholar XXXI (Spring 1962), 296-310.

[35]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1956, p. 66.

[36]Ibid., 1959, p. 41.

[37]Jerome Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1960).

[38]Ibid., p. 92.

[39]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1962-1966.

[40]James D. Koerner, "EDC: General Motors of Curriculum Reform," Saturday Review, L (August 19, 1967), 56-58; 70-71.

[41]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1966 p. 69.

[42]Ibid., 1968, p. 81.

[43]Samuel Ball and Gerry Ann Bogatz, The First Year of Sesame Street: An Evaluation (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1970).

[44]See Gary M. Ingersoll, "'Sesame Street' Can't Handle ALL the Traffic," Phi Delta Kappan, LII(November 1971), 185-186.

[45]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1965 p. 45.

[46]Carnegie Commission on Public Television, Public Television: A Program for Action (New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1967).

[47]Neil Hickey, "Public Television in Turmoil," TV Guide, July 23, 1977, pp. 2-5; 8-9.

[48]A key assistant to John Gardner was Ms. Helen Rowan, who served Gardner as an editor and special assistant since 1955.

[49]John W. Gardner, "Special Studies Project Report V," in Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc., The Pursuit of Excellence (New York; Doubleday & Company, 1958).

[50]Ibid., p. 38.

[51]President's Commission on National Goals, Goals for America (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Publishing Company, 1960), pp. 70-100.

[52]Ibid., p. 81.

[53]Arthur G. Powell, "A Historical Perspective," in Committee on the Graduate Study of Education, The Graduate Study of Education: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 94.

[54]This investigator was permitted to review project files of the Carnegie Corporation under the guidance of Ms. Florence Anderson, Secretary of the Corporation. Information contained in those files.

[55]87th Congress, 1st Session H. R. Document No. 92, "American Education - Message from the President Relative to American Education," February 20, 1961.

[56]John F. Kennedy, To Turn the Tide (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1962).

[57]Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1968).

[58]Ibid., p.56.

[59]The New York Times, July 25, 1965, p. 9E.

[60]"Back to the Foundations," Economist, CCXXI (December 31, 1966), 1391.

[61]John Goodlad, "Assessment of Educational Performance," in White Conference on Education: A Milestone for Educational Progress (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, August 1965), pp. 44-52.

[62]See critical analysis of Ralph W. Tyler's background in Harry A. Green et al., Measurement and Evaluation in the Secondary Schools (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1957).

[63]Ralph W. Tyler, "National Planning and Quality Control in Education," a paper delivered at the National Conference on Curriculum Experimentation, September 25-28, 1961. See Paul C. Rosenbloom, ed. Modern Viewpoints in the Curriculum (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1964), pp. 11-18.

[64]Carnegie Corporation of New York, "The Gross Educational Product: How Much are Students Learning?" Carnegie Quarterly, XIV (Spring 1966), 2.

[65]For example, see Francis Keppel, "National Assessment: We Badly Need It," in National Assessment: Pro and Con (Washington, DC: National Educational Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1966).

[66]Jack R. Frymier, "National Assessment," in Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Evaluation as Feedback and Guide (Washington, DC: ASCD, 1967), p. 255.

[67]The New York Times, February 23, 1969, p. 9E.

[68]James B. Conant, Shaping Educational Policy (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1964).

[69]Ibid., p. 123.

[70]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1966, pp. 51-52.

[71]Ibid., p. 78

[72]Ibid., 1967, p. 83.

[73]Terry Sanford Storm Over the States (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 119.

[74]The New York Times, February 23, 1969, p. 9E.

[75]James S. Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1966).

[76]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1967, p. 24.

[77]Ibid., 1968, p. 31.

[78]Harold Howe II, "Growth and Growing Pains," Saturday Review, XLIX (December 17, 1966), 68.

[79]The New York Times, October 7, 1966, p. 25. Also see Charles and Bonnie Remberg, "Chicago: Legacy of an Ice Age," Saturday Review, L(May 20, 1967), 75.

[80]Education News, February 5, 1967, p. 1.

[81]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1968, p. 58.

[82]Richard Madden, "Goodell is No Bobby Kennedy -- But He's Trying Hard," The New York Times Magazine, October 26, 1969, p. 146.

[83]For example, see "Gardner Snubs President Boom but it Grows," The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, August 19, 1970, p. 1.

[84]James Cass, "Education in America: The New Guard Takes Over," Saturday Review, LII (March 15, 1969), 55.

[85]Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1966, p. 40.

[86]Charles E. Silberman, "Technology is Knocking at the Schoolhouse Door," Fortune, LXXIV (August 1966), 122.

[87]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970).

[88]See Alan Pifer, "Foundations and the Unity of Charitable Organizations," in Carnegie Corporation of New York, Annual Report, 1969, p. 3.

[89]David E. Weischadle, "Carnegie: A Case Study in How Foundations Make Decisions," Phi Delta Kappan, LVIII (October 1977), 110-114.

[90]C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 361.